

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has rejected all of the pending claims (Claims 38-49) based on 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Knowles et al. (US 6,810,232). It is well known that for a cited reference to be a "proper" anticipation reference each and every element of the subject invention must be specifically described within the four corners of the cited reference. It is respectfully submitted, once again, that the Examiner has failed to appreciate the heart of the subject invention. The Knowles et al. reference does not disclose or even suggest detecting a variably positionable grading label and, thus, it could not possibly be a proper anticipation reference. The Examiner appears to be missing the point that the subject invention detects the location of the grading label in ANY position on a document. *ALL OF THE SPECIFIC PLACES WHERE THE EXAMINER STATES THAT THIS VARIABLE LOCATION FEATURE IS DISCLOSED (IN KNOWLES ET AL., US 5,134,669, AND US 5,452,379) DO **NOT** SHOW THIS VARIABLE LOCATION FEATURE. WHAT IS DISCUSSED IN EVERY CITED PLACE IS THAT A BAR CODE OR MRI (MACHINE READABLE IDENTIFIER) MAY BE PLACE IN DIFFERENT POSITIONS THAT ARE THEN INPUT INTO THE CONTROLLING PROGRAM **BEFORE** THE INFORMATION SCAN TAKES PLACE (SPECIFICALLY IN KNOWLES ET AL. IT IS STATED AT COL. 8, LINES 45-48, "If a MRI is included on the documents to be imaged, the administrator will input the batch information into the system....."). THE SUBJECT INVENTION NEVER KNOWS THE LOCATION OF THE DATA FIELD UNTIL ITS COORDINATES ARE CALCULATED **AFTER** AN INFORMATION DIGITAL IMAGING SCAN OCCURS.*

Additionally, nowhere does Knowles et al. disclose, suggest, imply, or teach that they analyze the scanned image to find an image feature (calculate coordinates), unlike the subject invention. Clearly, this is element "d" in both independent claims (Claims 38 and 46).

Independent Claims 38 and 46 have been further amended to clarify and more clearly state the exact nature of the subject invention. The Examiner has not mentioned a 35 USC 103, obviousness, rejection, but plainly the Knowles et al. reference does not suggest, imply, or teach the claimed subject invention. **Again, if MRIs are present on the documents in the Knowles et al. reference then that MRI location information HAS to be input by the "administrator" at Step 607 in FIG. 6-1 (and Col. 8, lines 45-48) into the program so that a specific location that is pre-established at a KNOWN document position is activated, which is the exact opposite of what the subject invention accomplishes AUTOMATICALLY.**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections to the Claims and pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (916) 498-1010.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 21, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
James M. Ritchey Reg. No. 32,594